

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 17-20 and 23 are amended herein. Claims 1-23 remain pending in the application.

Informality in the Abstract of the Disclosure

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to for an informality. In particular, a close bracket is missing.

A substitute Abstract of the Disclosure is attached hereto. The Applicants respectfully request the originally filed Abstract of the Disclosure be deleted and replaced with the substitute Abstract of the Disclosure attached hereto.

Informality in the Specification

The specification allegedly contains an informality. In particular, a close bracket is missing on page 6, line 9.

Page 6, line 9 has been amended to correct any informalities. The Applicants respectfully request the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 8-10 and 13-15 over Tillgren

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 8-10 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Tillgren et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,339,706 ("Tillgren"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-4 recite, *inter alia*, a cordless telephone in a PSTN gateway role that allows a remote telephone piconet device to answer an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a piconet network. Claims 8-10 and 13-15 recite, *inter alia*, routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network.

Tillgren appears to disclose a wireless, voice-activated remote control device for controlling an electronic device having voice control circuitry (col. 3, lines 21-39). A short range wireless data and voice communication link,

for example Bluetooth, is established between the remote control device and an electronic device (Tillgren, col. 4, lines 26-65). An incoming call can be sent to the remote control device, a headset, from an electronic device, a mobile telephone (Tillgren, col. 11, lines 57-67).

Tillgren discloses using a remote control device in communication with a mobile cellular telephone through a piconet. The cellular telephone answers calls originated to itself and forwards those calls to a remote control headset device. Tillgren fails to disclose or suggest use of two telephony devices, much less one of those devices a remote telephone piconet device answering an incoming call directed to a cellular telephone over a piconet network, and routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network, as recited by claims 1-4, 8-10 and 13-15.

A benefit of allowing a remote telephone piconet device to answering an incoming call to a cellular telephone is, e.g., use of existing equipment with extended capability. Tillgren requires the use of a specialized headset device to communicate with a call designated to a cellular telephone. Using a telephone device to answer an incoming call directed to another telephone device would allow increased functionality of existing piconet devices without having to rely on specialized headsets, as required by the cited prior art. The prior art fails to disclose or suggest such a system and method with such an advantage.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-4, 8-10 and 13-15 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 5 over Tillgren in view of Slettengren

In the Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tillgren in view of Slettengren et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0028674 A1 ("Slettengren"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, a cordless telephone in a PSTN gateway role that allows a remote telephone piconet device to answer an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a piconet network.

As discussed above, Tillgren fails to disclose or suggest Tillgren fails to disclose or suggest use of two telephony devices, much less a remote telephone piconet device answering an incoming call directed to a cellular telephone, as recited by claim 5.

The Office Action relies on Slettengren to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Tillgren to arrive at the claimed invention.

Slettengren appears to disclose a communication system that includes a wireless communication device configured to receive incoming communications over a first communication channel and politeness requests over a second communication channel (Abstract). A politeness zone transmitter sends a politeness request to a cellular telephone that has entered a politeness zone (Slettengren, Fig. 8; page 10, paragraphs 0080-0082).

Slettengren discloses a cellular telephone 806 that receives a politeness request from a politeness transmitter 804 to control a ringer when the cellular telephone is in a designated area. The cellular telephone does **NOT** answer an incoming call designated for another telephone, much less answer an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a piconet network, as recited by claim 5.

Neither Tillgren nor Slettengren, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a cordless telephone in a PSTN gateway role that

allows a remote telephone piconet device to answer an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a piconet network, as recited by claim 5.

At best, even if the theoretical combination of Tillgren and Slettengren were obvious (which it are not), the combination would result in a headset receiving a telephone call from a cellular telephone over a piconet network, with the cellular telephone able to receive politeness requests that control a ringer. The theoretical combination of Tillgren and Slettengren fails to make up for the deficiency in Tillgren.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 5 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 12 and 17 over Tillgren in view of Lunsford

In the Office Action, claims 6, 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tillgren in view of Lunsford et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,614,350 ("Lunsford"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6, 12 and 17 are dependent on claims 1, 8 and 13 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 8 and 13.

Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*, a cordless telephone in a PSTN gateway role that allows a remote telephone piconet device to answer an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a piconet network. Claims 12 and 17 recite, *inter alia*, routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network.

As discussed above, Tillgren fails to disclose or suggest use of two telephony devices, much less a remote telephone piconet device answering an incoming call directed to a cellular telephone over a piconet network and routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network, as recited by claims 6, 12 and 17.

The Office Action relies on Lunsford to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Tillgren to arrive at the claimed invention.

Lunsford appears to disclose a method and system for effecting a security web upon multiple devices (Abstract). Each device within a Bluetooth piconet periodically polls for the presence of all other devices in the piconet (Lunsford, col. 8, lines 42-43). If the signal from any device is not detected by any other device in the piconet, then all the devices sound an alarm (Lunsford, col. 8, lines 43-45).

Lunsford discloses a method of monitoring the presence of devices within a piconet for security purposes. Lunsford's invention is directed toward security within a piconet and fails to disclose or suggest directing calls and routing audio to devices within the piconet, much less a remote telephone piconet device answering an incoming call directed to a cellular telephone over a piconet network and routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network, as recited by claims 6, 12 and 17.

Neither Tillgren nor Lunsford, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a remote telephone piconet device answering an incoming call directed to a cellular telephone over a piconet network and routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network, as recited by claims 6, 12 and 17.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6, 12 and 17 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 11 and 16 over Tillgren in view of Larsson

In the Office Action, claims 7, 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tillgren in view of Larsson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,535,498 ("Larsson"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 11 and 16 are dependent on claims 1, 8 and 13 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 8 and 13.

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, a cordless telephone in a PSTN gateway role that allows a remote telephone piconet device to answer an incoming call to a cellular telephone over a piconet network. Claims 11 and 16 recite, *inter alia*, routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network.

As discussed above, Tillgren fails to disclose or suggest use of two telephony devices, much less a remote telephone piconet device answering an incoming call directed to a cellular telephone over a piconet network and a remote telephone piconet device answering an incoming call directed to a cellular telephone over a piconet network and routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network, as recited by claims 7, 11 and 16.

The Office Action relies on Larsson to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Tillgren to arrive at the claimed invention.

Larsson appears to disclose a method of updating the routing of information in an ad-hoc network (Abstract). A scatternet is formed by a plurality of piconets (Fig. 3).

Larsson is relied on to simply disclose a scatternet, with the invention being directed toward routing of information through various paths through an ad-hoc network, including a scatternet. Although Larsson discloses that devices within the ad-hoc network can include telephones, there is no suggestion for one telephony device to answer an incoming call for another telephony device, much less to a remote telephone piconet device answering an

incoming call directed to a cellular telephone over a piconet network routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network, as recited by claims 7, 11 and 16.

Neither Tillgren nor Lunsford, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a remote telephone piconet device answering an incoming call directed to a cellular telephone over a piconet network and routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet network, as recited by claims 7, 11 and 16.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 7, 11 and 16 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 18 and 21-23 over Tillgren in view of Hendrickson

In the Office Action, claims 18 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tillgren in view of Hendrickson, U.S. Patent No. 5,697,062 ("Hendrickson"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 18 and 21-23 recite, *inter alia*, passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet.

As discussed above, Tillgren discloses using a remote control device in communication with a mobile cellular telephone through a piconet. The cellular telephone answers calls originated to itself and forwards those calls to a remote control headset device. Tillgren fails to disclose or suggest use of two telephony devices, much less passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet and routing audio from a cellular telephone to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet, as recited by claims 18 and 21-23.

The Office Action relies on Hendrickson to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Tillgren to arrive at the claimed invention.

Hendrickson appears to disclose a method and apparatus for improved link establishment and monitoring in a communications system. The method and apparatus uses messages with a set data field containing N-bit channel markers and synchronization words for link establishment and monitoring (Hendrickson, Abstract). The improved link establishment is applied to a cordless telephone (Hendrickson, Fig. 1).

Hendrickson has little relevance to the claimed invention. Hendrickson's invention is directed toward a cordless telephone. A conventional cordless telephone does **NOT** utilize piconet communication, and as such Hendrickson fails to even mention the use of a piconet network. Hendrickson is relied on to disclose audibly ringing of a receiver in response to receipt of incoming call information, however the claims require such information be transferred over a wireless piconet. Hendrickson fails to disclose or suggest use of a wireless piconet, much less passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet, as recited by claims 18 and 21-23.

Neither Tillgren nor Hendrickson, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet, as recited by claims 18 and 21-23.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 18 and 21-23 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 19 over Tillgren in view of Hendrickson and Raffel

In the Office Action, claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tillgren in view of Hendrickson, and further in view of Raffel et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,675,629 ("Raffel"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 19 is dependent on claim 18, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

Claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet.

As discussed above, Tillgren in view of Hendrickson fails to disclose or suggest passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet, as recited by claim 19.

The Office Action relies on Raffel to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Tillgren in view of Hendrickson to arrive at the claimed invention.

Raffel appears to disclose a mobile station that communicates with both a cellular network and a cordless cellular base station utilizing the same cellular frequency range and communication protocol (Abstract). When a call is received on a landline associated with the cordless cellular base station, all extensions connected to the landline ring and all registered mobile stations are sent a page (Raffel, col. 37, lines 20-29).

Raffel discloses a cordless cellular base station that is able to ring multiple extensions in response to an incoming call. However, the ring signal sent to the multiple extensions is **NOT** sent over a piconet. Raffel fails to disclose or suggest use of a piconet to send signals between devices, much less passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet, as recited by claim 19.

Neither Tillgren. Hendrickson nor Raffel, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet, as recited by claim 19.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 19 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20 over Tillgren in view of Hendrickson and Slettengren

In the Office Action, claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Tillgren in view of Hendrickson, and further in view of Slettengren. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 20 is dependent on claim 18, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

Claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet.

As discussed above, Tillgren in view of Hendrickson fails to disclose or suggest passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet, as recited by claim 20.

The Office Action relies on Slettengren to allegedly make up for the deficiencies in Tillgren in view of Hendrickson to arrive at the claimed invention.

As discussed above, Slettengren discloses a cellular telephone 806 that receives a politeness request from a politeness transmitter 804 to control a ringer when the cellular telephone is in a designated area. The cellular telephone is not passed incoming call information from a telephony device, much less over a piconet, as recited by claim 20.


Neither Tillgren, Hendrickson nor Raffel, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest passing incoming call information from a wireless telephone receiving an incoming call, to a remote telephone piconet device over a wireless piconet, as recited by claim 20.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claim 20 is patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC



William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307

WHB/df